



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

[Signature]
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,649	04/13/2001	Satoshi Okamoto	0879-0310P	1743

2292 7590 08/10/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

AGGARWAL, YOGESH K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/833,649	Applicant(s) OKAMOTO, SATOSHI	
	Examiner Yogesh K. Aggarwal	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/01/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner's response:

2. Examiner has carefully read the arguments on Pages 18-22 of response filed 03/01/2006 and the main argument is transmitting image data stored in a **detachable** storage medium. Claims 1-29 and 63 recite the newly recited limitation detachable storage medium, so new grounds of rejection will be applied to these claims. Claims 30-62 do not recite detachable storage medium. Therefore in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., **detachable** storage medium) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Previous grounds of rejection for claims 30- 62 would be maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2622

4. Claims 1, 3, 4, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ichihara (US Patent # 6,977,680).

[Claim 1]

Ichihara teaches an image data transmitting device (figures 3 and 4, camera 30), comprising: a communication device (communication apparatus 35) that transmits a subject main image data stored in a detachable storage medium to an external apparatus (hard disk 41, col. 5 lines 38-41, col. 1 lines 25-28); and an information processing device that deletes the subject main image data stored in the storage medium after the communication device transmits the subject main image data, and that keeps reduced image data of the main image data stored in the storage medium after the subject main image data is deleted (col. 5 lines 45-49, col. 5 line 66-col. 6 line 22).

[Claim 3]

Ichihara teaches a CPU 30 that controls the data and the whole process when the camera is connected to a PC (col. 5 lines 24-30).

[Claim 4]

Ichihara teaches transmitting images automatically to an external device (col. 5 lines 45-49).

[Claim 14]

Ichihara teaches an imaging device (figure 3, CCD 32) that captures the main image data, wherein the main image data is stored in the storage medium (flash memory 36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2622

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (US Patent # 6,977,680) in view of Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870).

[Claim 2]

Ichihara fails to teach a user setting erasure setting for the images. However Nanba teaches a delete key D for deleting the images recorded in the memory card 8 (col. 3 lines 43-46, figure 1). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art that a delete key may be pressed at any time by a user e.g. after the communication device transmits the main image data to the external apparatus.

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ichihara and Nanba, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have user setting erasure setting for the images in order to delete the images according to the user's commands.

7. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (US Patent # 6,977,680) in view of Tamura (JP Patent # 09-37125).

[Claims 5 and 6]

Ichihara fails to teach wherein the information-processing device adds an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a file name of a file of the main image data transmitted. However Tamura teaches wherein the information processing device adds an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a file name of a file of the main image data transmitted (Paragraph 23). Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ichihara and Tamura, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have added an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a

Art Unit: 2622

file name of a file of the main image data transmitted in order for the user to easily distinguish the transmitted files.

8. Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (US Patent # 6,977,680), Tamura (JP Patent # 09-37125) and in further view of Tomat et al. (US Patent # 6,784,925).

[Claims 7, 10 and 11]

Ichihara in view of Tamura teaches the limitations of claim 6 but fails to teach “further comprising a first displaying device that displays a reduced image with at least one of information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus and an information processing device that adds the information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus”. However Tomat et al. teaches that a displaying device (figure 22, element 190) that displays thumbnail images (192) along with information like an acquired icon 224 (figure 24) which indicates the type of the device from where the information can be downloaded and that the main image (col. 15 lines 66-67, col. 16 lines 1-10) and numeral 212 (figure 23) that indicates that indicates which photogroup the picture belongs to. In other words, whether the main image has been transmitted from the camera or any other external device. The PC or camera inherently have a CPU which adds the icons (224 and 212) associated with the thumbnail images 192. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ichihara, Tamura and Tomat et al., it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have a first displaying device that displays a reduced image with at least one of information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus and an information processing device that adds

Art Unit: 2622

the information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus. The benefit of doing so would be so that the user can easily verify the source of the images and auto-correct the images by looking at the icons associated with the thumbnail images.

[Claim 8]

Ichihara in view of Tamura teaches the limitations of claim 6 but fails to teach “a third setting device with which the user sets reception of the main image data according to the reduced image data stored in the storage medium, wherein the communication device receives the main image data from the external apparatus and stores the main image data in the storage medium”.

However Tomat et al. teaches that a displaying device (figure 22, element 190) that displays thumbnail images (in area 192) that is selected and will cause a full-resolution image associated with it to be copied to the storage device (col. 16 lines 11-20) after downloading from the digital camera in order to view the main image corresponding to the thumbnail image. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ichihara, Tamura and Tomat et al., it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have a first displaying device that displays a reduced image and a setting device with which the user sets reception of the main image data according to the reduced image data stored in the storage medium, wherein the communication device receives the main image data from the external apparatus and stores the main image data in the storage medium. The benefit of doing so would be so that the user can easily manipulate images and view them based on the thumbnail images.

[Claim 9]

Art Unit: 2622

Tomat teaches that after the full resolution file is moved to a storage device (along with associated information) the corresponding photogroup is deleted from the camera so that the CPU replaces the previous information that the main image has been transmitted (col. 16 lines 11-27).

9. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (US Patent # 6,977,680) in view of Allen et al. (US Patent # 5,737,491).

[Claim 12]

Ichihara teaches the limitations of claim 1 but fails to teach “a fourth setting device with which the user sets transmission of the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus, wherein the information processing device produces a transmission information file that shows information set with the fourth setting device, and the communication device transmits the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus according to the information shown in the transmission information file”. However Allen et al. teaches an image file being appended to the digitized voice command header and transmitted to the image fulfillment server where it is compared and decoded based on the appended voice file (col. 5 lines 6-17) in order to decode the image file. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ichihara and Allen, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a device with which the user sets transmission of the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus, wherein the information processing device produces a transmission information file that shows information set with the setting device, and the communication device transmits the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus according to the information shown in the transmission

Art Unit: 2622

information file. The benefit of doing so would be to have the image file decoded by the external apparatus according to the transmission file generated by the transmission device.

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (US Patent # 6,977,680) in view of Oie (US Patent # 6,188,431).

[Claim 13]

Ichihara teaches the limitations of claim 1 but fails to teach “a second displaying device that displays a message that the main image data is being transmitted while the communication device is transmitting the main image data to the external apparatus”. However Oie teaches that during image transmission the message “WAIT” indicating that the image data is currently being transferred appears on the LCD (col. 6 lines 25-36) in order to inform the user that the file is being transmitted. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ichihara and Oie, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a second displaying device that displays a message that the main image data is being transmitted while the communication device is transmitting the main image data to the external apparatus. The benefit of doing so would be so that the user can know if the file has been transmitted successfully.

11. Claims 15-21 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (US Patent # 6,977,680) in view of Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440).

[Claims 15 and 16]

Ichihara teaches the limitations of claim 1 but fails to teach “wherein the reduced image data is produced simultaneously with production and deletion of main image data”. However Niikawa teaches the generation of thumbnail image data and main image data in a single file, which must

Art Unit: 2622

be generated or deleted simultaneously in order to conform to the EXIF standard (Paragraph 41 and figure 3). Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ichihara and Niikawa, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the reduced image data be produced simultaneously with production of main image data in order to conform with EXIF standard. The benefit of doing so would be to store both the low-resolution and high-resolution data together in an EXIF file format.

[Claims 17-21, 29]

These claims are similar to claims 2-6, 14. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon claims 2-6, 14.

12. Claims 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (US Patent # 6,977,680) and Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440) and in further view of Tomat et al. (US Patent # 6,784,925).

[Claims 22-26]

These claims are similar to claims 7-11. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon claims 7-11.

13. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (US Patent # 6,977,680) and Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440) and in further view of Allen et al. (US Patent # 5,737,491).

[Claim 27]

This claim is similar to claim 12. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon claim 12.

Art Unit: 2622

14. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (US Patent # 6,977,680) and Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440) and in further view of Oie (US Patent # 6,784,925).

[Claim 28]

This claim is similar to claim 13. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon claim 13.

15. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichihara (US Patent # 6,977,680) in view of Shiohara (US Patent # 6,618,553).

[Claim 63]

Ichihara teaches an image data processing device (figures 3 and 4, camera 30), a transmission device (communication apparatus 35) that transmits at least said basic image data to an external storage device (hard disk 41, col. 5 lines 38-41).

Ichihara teaches generating thumbnail data in the external device but fails to teach a processing device that generates thumbnail data in a digital camera and a control device that controls said processing device. However Shiohara teaches a digital camera (figure 1, element 100) that has a processing device (signal processing section 7) that generates a thumbnail image (col. 4 lines 15-30) and a control section 4 for controlling the operation of the signal processing section 7 (col. 4 lines 8-13).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ichihara and Shiohara, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a processing device that generates thumbnail data in a digital camera and a control device that controls said processing device as taught in Shiohara to be implemented into the system of Ichihara in order to

Art Unit: 2622

simplify the operation of the external device and to reduce the overhead time required to transmit the thumbnail image data from the external device to the digital camera thereby freeing up the bandwidth for transmitting the next image.

16. Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US Patent # 6,263,106) in view of Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870).

[Claim 30]

Yamagata teaches an image transmitting method comprising an image pickup device (figure 2, CCD 28) that outputs an image signal output by the CCD 28 is processed by a signal processing circuit 33, and is then converted to a digital image signal by means of an analog-digital (A/D) converter 34, stored in a image data memory 35 as digital image data. Yamagata also teaches that a predetermined processing is applied to the image data stored in the image data memory 35 when the image data is transferred to the IC memory card M by an image data processing circuit 36 through an IC Memory card control circuit 41 (col. 4 lines 44-56). Yamagata further teaches in figures 10 and 11 a video card data compression mode wherein at step S163, a selected file (main image data) that has been already transmitted therein is read out of IC memory card M, is stored in the image data memory 35 is compressed at step S165 and stored as compressed image data (reduced image data) (col. 11 lines 39-65, figure 11). Then at step S166, the selected image file (main image data) is deleted and stored in the IC memory card M, since the newly compressed image data will be stored. Finally at step S167, the newly compressed file stored in the image memory 35 is transferred to the IC memory card M to be stored therein (col. 11 line 65-col. 12 line 3).

Yamagata teaches transmitting data to an external memory card but fails to teach transmitting data to an external device. However Nanba teaches transmitting images to a memory card (steps S2-S9, figure 6) and if the memory card is not available or unable to record, the images are transferred to an external device (PC, steps S10-S16) in order to easily manage the photographed images and not to lose a photographing chance if the memory card is full.

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Yamagata and Nanba, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have transmitted images to an external device (PC) instead of a memory card incorporated in the system of Yamagata as taught by Nanba in order to easily manage the photographed images and not to lose a photographing chance if the memory card is full.

[Claim 31]

Nanba teaches a delete key D for deleting the images recorded in the memory card 8 (col. 3 lines 43-46, figure 1). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art that a delete key may be pressed at any time by a user e.g. after the communication device transmits the main image data to the external apparatus.

[Claim 32]

Nanba teaches a CPU 211 that controls the data and the whole process when the camera is connected to a PC (col. 6 lines 20-30).

[Claim 33]

Nanba teaches transmitting images to a memory card (steps S2-S9, figure 6) and if the memory card is not available or unable to record, the images are transferred to automatically to an external device (PC, steps S10-S16).

Art Unit: 2622

17. Claims 34 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US Patent # 6,263,106), Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870) and further in view of Tamura (JP Patent # 09-37125).

[Claims 34 and 38]

Yamagata in view of Nanba fails to teach wherein the information-processing device adds an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a file name of a file of the main image data transmitted. However Yamagata teaches wherein the information processing device adds an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a file name of a file of the main image data transmitted (Paragraph 23). Therefore taking the combined teachings of Yamagata, Nanba and Yamagata, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have added an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a file name of a file of the main image data transmitted in order for the user to easily distinguish the transmitted files.

18. Claims 35-37, 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US Patent # 6,263,106), Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870), Tamura (JP Patent # 09-37125) and in further view of Tomat et al. (US Patent # 6,784,925).

[Claims 35, 42 and 43]

Yamagata, Nanba in view of Tamura teaches the limitations of claim 38 but fails to teach “further comprising a first displaying device that displays a reduced image with at least one of information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus and an information processing device that adds the information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus”. However

Art Unit: 2622

Tomat et al. teaches that a displaying device (figure 22, element 190) that displays thumbnail images (192) along with information like an acquired icon 224 (figure 24) which indicates the type of the device from where the information can be downloaded and that the main image (col. 15 lines 66-67, col. 16 lines 1-10) and numeral 212 (figure 23) that indicates that indicates which photogroup the picture belongs to. In other words, whether the main image has been transmitted from the camera or any other external device. The PC or camera inherently have a CPU which adds the icons (224 and 212) associated with the thumbnail images 192. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Yamagata, Nanba, Tamura and Tomat et al., it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have a first displaying device that displays a reduced image with at least one of information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus and an information processing device that adds the information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus. The benefit of doing so would be so that the user can easily verify the source of the images and auto-correct the images by looking at the icons associated with the thumbnail images.

[Claim 36]

Yamagata, Nanba in view of Tamura teaches the limitations of claim 38 but fails to teach “a third setting device with which the user sets reception of the main image data according to the reduced image data stored in the storage medium, wherein the communication device receives the main image data from the external apparatus and stores the main image data in the storage medium”. However Tomat et al. teaches that a displaying device (figure 22, element 190) that displays thumbnail images (in area 192) that is selected and will cause a full-resolution image associated

Art Unit: 2622

with it to be copied to the storage device (col. 16 lines 11-20) after downloading from the digital camera in order to view the main image corresponding to the thumbnail image. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Yamagata, Nanba, Tamura and Tomat et al., it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have a first displaying device that displays a reduced image and a setting device with which the user sets reception of the main image data according to the reduced image data stored in the storage medium, wherein the communication device receives the main image data from the external apparatus and stores the main image data in the storage medium. The benefit of doing so would be so that the user can easily manipulate images and view them based on the thumbnail images.

[Claim 41]

Tomat teaches that after the full resolution file is moved to a storage device (along with associated information) the corresponding photogroup is deleted from the camera so that the CPU replaces the previous information that the main image has been transmitted (col. 16 lines 11-27).

19. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US Patent # 6,263,106) in view of Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870) and in further view of Allen et al. (US Patent # 5,737,491).

[Claim 44]

Yamagata in view of Nanba teaches the limitations of claim 30 but fails to teach “a fourth setting device with which the user sets transmission of the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus, wherein the information processing device produces a transmission information file that shows information set with the fourth setting device, and the

Art Unit: 2622

communication device transmits the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus according to the information shown in the transmission information file”.

However Allen et al. teaches an image file being appended to the digitized voice command header and transmitted to the image fulfillment server where it is compared and decoded based on the appended voice file (col. 5 lines 6-17) in order to decode the image file. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Yamagata, Nanba and Allen, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a device with which the user sets transmission of the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus, wherein the information processing device produces a transmission information file that shows information set with the setting device, and the communication device transmits the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus according to the information shown in the transmission information file. The benefit of doing so would be to have the image file decoded by the external apparatus according to the transmission file generated by the transmission device.

20. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US Patent # 6,263,106) in view of Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870) and in further view of Oie (US Patent # 6,188,431).

[Claim 45]

Yamagata in view of Nanba teaches the limitations of claim 30 but fails to teach “a second displaying device that displays a message that the main image data is being transmitted while the communication device is transmitting the main image data to the external apparatus”. However Oie teaches that during image transmission the message “WAIT” indicating that the image data

Art Unit: 2622

is currently being transferred appears on the LCD (col. 6 lines 25-36) in order to inform the user that the file is being transmitted. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Yamagata, Nanba and Oie, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a second displaying device that displays a message that the main image data is being transmitted while the communication device is transmitting the main image data to the external apparatus. The benefit of doing so would be so that the user can know if the file has been transmitted successfully.

21. Claims 46-51 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US Patent # 6,263,106) in view of Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870) and in further view of Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440).

[Claims 46-51]

Yamagata in view of Nanba teaches the limitations of claim 30 but fails to teach “wherein the reduced image data is produced simultaneously with production and deletion of main image data”. However Niikawa teaches the generation of thumbnail image data and main image data in a single file, which must be generated or deleted simultaneously in order to conform to the EXIF standard (Paragraph 41 and figure 3). Therefore taking the combined teachings of Yamagata, Nanba and Niikawa, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the reduced image data be produced simultaneously with production of main image data in order to conform with EXIF standard. The benefit of doing so would be to store both the low-resolution and high-resolution data together in an EXIF file format. Also See claim rejections for claims 30-33, 34 and 38.

[Claim 55]

Art Unit: 2622

This claim is similar to claim 38. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon claim 38.

22. Claims 52-54 and 56-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US Patent # 6,263,106) in view of Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870) and Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440) and in further view of Tomat et al. (US Patent # 6,784,925).

[Claims 52-54]

These claims are similar to claims 35-37, 39-43 respectively. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon claims 35-37, 39-43.

[Claims 56-60]

These claims are similar to claims 39-43. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon claims 39-43.

23. Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US Patent # 6,263,106) in view of Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870) and Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440) and in further view of Allen et al. (US Patent # 5,737,491).

[Claim 61]

This claim is similar to claim 44. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon claim 44.

24. Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US Patent # 6,263,106) in view of Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870) and Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440) and in further view of Oie (US Patent # 6,784,925).

[Claim 62]

Art Unit: 2622

This claim is similar to claim 45. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon claim 45.

Conclusion

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yogesh K. Aggarwal whose telephone number is (571) 272-7360. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM-5:30PM.

26. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571)-272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

27. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

YKA
August 6, 2006



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER